Public Works (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 339 I

DATED 5. April 1897

7/4/97

[Despatch Abstract.]

X Branch Channel, Periyar Project: re revised estimate of Rs. 95,890 for the —, approved with remarks.

90/4

5th

P.W. 20.
15,00—30-11-96.

Indexed 7/4/97

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government {1897} of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. } 1897. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

G.O., No. 339 I., 5th April 1897.

APRIL.

X Branch channel, Periyar project

The revised estimate of Rs. 95,890 for the —, approved with remarks.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

Read—the following papers :—

From Lieutenant-Colonel O. V. BODDY, R.E., Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Trichinopoly, 16th March 1897, No. 409 M.D.

I have the honour to forward herewith a revised estimate for the excavation of the X Branch channel of the Periyár canal.

2. The difficulty that has been experienced in drawing up this estimate, and the method adopted in doing so, is set forth in letter, No. 103 E., dated 14th January 1897, from the Executive Engineer on Special Duty, Madura, a copy of which is forwarded.

3. The amount of the revised estimate is Rs. 95,890. The original estimate as per Project blue book for the work was Rs. 66,225, and the same amount was sanctioned in the revised estimate approved in G.O., No. 97 I., dated 3rd February 1894. The excess therefore of the revised over the original estimate amounts to Rs. 29,665.

4. The chief cause for this excess as explained in the comparative statement is that in consequence of the F. S. L. of the channel being increased from 2 feet to 3 feet, and the fall per mile reduced from 6 feet to 3 feet, a re-alignment of the channel was found necessary, which again necessitated rock-cutting and heavy embankments for which enhanced rates had to be paid.

5. The manner in which this estimate has been drawn up leaves much to be desired, but as the Executive Engineer, who is on the spot, is unable to submit a more satisfactory one, I forward the estimate, as it is, for your approval and sanction.

6. The work is approaching completion and has been paid for at the rates entered in the revised estimate ; the expenditure on the work up to the end of December 1896 is Rs. 85,544.

Enclosure.

From T. W. S. SMYTH, Esq., Executive Engineer on Special Duty, Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 14th January 1897, No. 103 E.

In submitting the estimate for the X Branch channel, I have the honour to state that the abstract estimate is prepared partly from estimate detail measurement but mostly from the actual work done.

The amount of work done and remaining to be done on 31st May is shown in a statement. The latter quantity is calculated for the Chunnambur off-take by deducting the work done up to 31st May from the estimated quantity.

The estimate was received on the 27th of June 1896 and returned as it was found that several of the items had already been exceeded with orders that the actual work remaining to be done on 31st May should be estimated and added to the work done up to that date.

Judging from the statement now submitted this should not have taken more than a week, but actually the estimate was not received in my office until the 8th of November 1896. No detail measurements for work remaining to be done were even then sent and on these being called for, a statement not in the least agreeing with the estimate was submitted by the Sub-divisional officer. I have returned this statement for explanation and submit the estimate as it is. To the best of my knowledge and belief it gives very approximately what will be the total cost of the work, and if there is any difference it will be slight.

The detail measurements of the main channel and Tiruvadoor off-take do not correspond with the abstracts, as the work registers have been used for calculating the latter. I am unable to explain why they differ to such a degree.

The amount requiring sanction is Rs. 29,665. The amount sanctioned for the X Branch channel including all masonry works (*vide* revised estimate accompanying G.O., No. 97 I. of 3rd February 1894) is Rs. 1,65,960 and the estimates sanctioned amount to Rs. 1,53,011, leaving a balance of Rs. 12,949.

It has been impossible to find out whether all this sum or, if not all, what part of it is available to meet the excess of Rs. 29,665, as part of the sum appears to have already been appropriated by transfer to meet expenditure on unforeseen works. So the estimate has been submitted without this information.

In addition to the excess now reported a further sum of Rs. 3,000 (three thousand) will probably be required for certain cross drainage works and bridges or ramps.

No. 81 I.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The accompanying revised estimate for the 10th Branch channel, Periyár project, is submitted for sanction.

2. The original estimates for the Periyár distributary works were prepared in 1871–72, but when the works were about to be put in hand it was found that almost every design had to be altered. In fact the sanctioned estimates were in almost all cases set aside, but as revised estimates could not be made at once they have been prepared as each work was taken up.

3. The 10th Branch channel work was begun in May 1893, with very extensive deviations from the original design. The line was altered so as to command more land and the section altered to carry 3 feet depth of water with gradient of 3 feet a mile instead of 2 feet depth with a gradient of 6 feet a mile. There is nothing to show why a revised estimate was not made out at once, but there is some excuse for the omission for the reason that there are some very large and uncertain items which could not be estimated with any accuracy until the work had made some progress. It should however have been submitted long before now correct and complete. The Executive Engineer describes in his report the difficulty he has had in getting the necessary measurements. The estimate, as it stands, is reported not to be exact, but the Executive Engineer states that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, it gives very approximately what will be the total cost of the work. From the first paragraph of his report it is presumed that he intends to recover a large overpayment alleged to have been fraudulently obtained. The matter was alluded to in one of the Progress reports.

4. The Executive Engineer when preparing the revised list of the Project works in 1893 showed a saving of nearly Rs. 8,000 in the drops. The amounts sanctioned for all other works were allowed to stand as he did not anticipate any excess. The revised estimates for the masonry works have been severally sanctioned separately and the present estimate compares only with the amount sanctioned for earthwork, item 572 of the revised estimate, Rs. 66,225. It is however to be observed that the old estimate includes Rs. 7,920 for 18 miles of distributaries to which there is no corresponding item in the revised estimates. The distributaries are being provided on separate estimates and are found to cost several times the rate anticipated. To compare the two estimates the Rs. 7,920 should be deducted leaving Rs. 58,305 against Rs. 95,890, an actual excess of Rs. 37,585 or over 64 per cent. The excess in quantities is about 25 per cent. due to higher embankments and change of line. Nearly Rs. 18,000 of the excess is due to the omission (probably wrongly) from the original estimate of any provision for excavating rock.

5. The Project estimate is to be closed at the end of this month, and as the funds for unforeseen works are exhausted the excess will have to be included in the list of incomplete works to be submitted to the Government of India when the accounts for the year have been audited.

Chepauk,
26th March 1897.

(Signed) F. J. WILSON,
for Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

ORDER—No. 339 I., dated 5th April 1897.

The revised estimate, amounting to Rs. 95,890, for the X Branch channel of the Periyár project, is approved in lieu of the provision of Rs. 66,225 made for item 572 of the revised estimate printed in Proceedings of Madras Government, No. 97 I., dated 3rd February 1894. The unexpended balance of the revised estimate for the channel on 1st April 1897 will be included in the schedule to be submitted for the project in accordance with Code II, Chapter V, paragraph 35, Rule III.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, with three enclosures.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. A. F. Eccleston.

Public Works Department,

Irrigation Branch.

No. 339 I of 5-4-97

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

Read the following

From Supg: Engineer, Sixth circle, NO: 409. M. D. dated 16th March 1897.

Note by the Chief Engr: for Irrign, NO: 81 . I. dated 26th March 97.

The revised estimate, amounting to Rs 95,890, for the X Branch Channel of the Periyar Project, is approved in lieu of the provision of Rs 66,225 made for item 572 of the revised estimate printed in P. M. G. NO 97. I. dated 3rd February 1894. The unexpended balance of the revised estimate for the channel on 1st April 1897 will be included in the schedule to be submitted for the Project in accordance with Code II, Chapter V, para 35, rule III.

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrigatn.

" Supg: Engineer, Sixth circle. with 3 enclos.

" Examiner, P. W. Accounts.

E. I. Form No 1—1,000—27-11-96.

Public Works (1897) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

Current No: 3426

ISSUE No. 81 I

To

The Joint Secretary to Gov
P W D I Bran

(Reply to letter No. , dated).

Dated 26th March 1897

Recd: 3.4.97
~~**Despatched**~~

Enclosures * 5

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

"X" Branch channel of the Periyar Project Estimate of Rs 95,890 for the — Notes Submitting with remarks the accompanying — for sanction

E. I. Form No. 13—2,000—23-2-97.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Sent to Government with No. I.,
dated 1897.
Printed with G.O., No. I.,
dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
" 2 "
" 3 "
" 4 "
" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

5 P.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

NO: 81 .I.

The accompanying revised estimate for the 10th Branch Channel, Periyar Project, is submitted for sanction.

2. The original estimates for the Periyar distri-butary works were prepared in 1871-72 but when the works were about to be put in hand it was found that almost every design had to be altered. In fact the sanctioned estimates were in almost all cases set aside but as revised estimates could not be made at once they have been prepared as each work was taken up.

3. The 10th Branch Channel work was begun in May 1893, with very extensive deviations from the original design. The line was altered so as to command more land and the section altered to carry three feet depth of water with gradient of three feet a mile instead of 2 ft depth with a gradient of 6 feet a mile. There is nothing to show why a revised estimate was not made out at once but there is some excuse for the omission for the reason that there are some very large and uncertain items which could not be estimated with any accuracy until the work had made some progress. It should however have been submitted long before now, correct and complete. The Executive Engineer describes in his report the difficulty he has had in getting the necessary measurements. The estimate as it stands is reported not to be exact but the Executive Engineer states that to the best of his knowledge and belief it gives very approximately what will be the total cost of the work. From the first para of his report it is presumed that he intends to recover a large overpayment alleged to have been fraudulently obtained. The matter was alluded to in one of the Progress Reports.

4. The Executive Engineer when preparing the revised list of the Project Works in 1893 showed a saving of

of nearly Rs 8000 in the drops. The amounts sanctioned for all other works were allowed to stand as he did not anticipate any excess. The revised estimates for the masonry works have been severally sanctioned separately and the present estimate compares only with the amount sanctioned for earthwork, item 572 of the revised estimate, Rs 66,225. It is however to be observed that the old estimate includes Rs 7,920 for 18 miles of distributaries to which there is no corresponding item in the revised estimates. The distributaries are being provided on separate estimates and are found to cost several times the rate anticipated. To acompare the two estimates the Rs 7920 should be deducted leaving Rs 58,305 against Rs 95,890 an actual excess of Rs 37,585 or over 64 per cent. The excess in quantities is about 25 per cent due to higher embankments and change of line. Nearly Rs 18,000 of the excess is due to the omission (probably wrongly) from the original estimate of any provision for excavating rock.

5. The Project estimate is to be closed at the end of this month and as the funds for unforeseen works are exhausted the excess will have to be included in the list of incomplete works to be submitted to the Government of India when the accounts for the year have been audited.

[signature]

for Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Chepauk

26th March 1897.

To

The Joint Secretary to Government

Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch.

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 42 M.D.

339

Order

3339

From

The Supdg Engineer VI C

No. 409 M.D.

Dated 16th March 1897.

Received 18th March 1897

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

X Branch Channel of the Periyar Project submitting for sanction a revised estimate of Rs 95.890 for the execution of the —

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

3 S.P

Letter from T. W. S. Smyth Esqre - Executive Engineer on Special duty - Madura to the Superintending Engineer VI Circle - Trichinopoly -, No: 103 E. dated 14 January 1897: —

In Submitting the estimate for the X Branch Channel, I have the honor to state that the abstract Estimate is prepared partly from estimate, detail measurement but mostly from the actual work done.

The amount of work done & remaining to be done on 31 May is shewn in a Statement. The latter quantity is calculated for the Chunnambur off, take by deducting the work done up to 31st May from the estimated quantity.

The estimate was received on the 27 of June 1896 and returned as it was found that several of the items had already been exceeded with orders that the actual work remaining to be done on 31st May should be estimated and

added

added to the work done up to that date.

Judging from the Statement now submitted this should not have taken more than a week but actually the estimate was not received in my office until the 8th of November 1896. No detail measurements for work remaining to be done were even then sent & on these being called for, a Statement not in the least agreeing with the estimate, was submitted by the Sub Divisional officer. I have returned this Statement for explanation and submit the estimate as it is. To the best of my knowledge and belief it gives very approximately what will be the total cost of the work and if there is any difference it will be slight.

The detail measurements of the main Channel & Tirwadow offtake do not correspond with the abstracts as the work Registers have been used for calculating the latter.

I

I am unable to explain why they differ to such a degree.

4 S.P.

The amount requiring sanction is Rs 29,665. The amount sanctioned for the 10th Branch Channel including all masonry works vide revised estimate accompanying G.O. No 97 I of 3d February 1894 is Rs 1,15,960 and the estimates sanctioned amount to Rs 1,53,011 leaving a balance of Rs 12,949.

It has been impossible to find out whether all this sum or if not all what part of it is available to meet the excess of Rs 29,665 as part of the sum appears to have already been appropriated by transfer to meet expenditure on unforeseen works. So the estimate has been submitted without this information.

In addition to the excess now reported a further sum of Rupees 3,000, three thousand, will probably be required for certain cross drainage

works

works and bridges or ramps.

"True Copy"

O. V. Hodley Lieutt Coll. R.E.
Superintending Engineer
VI Circle
16. 3. 97.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
16.3.97
No. 14 2 M.D.
7

D. G. H. 18/3/97

P.W.E. 4
3426/57

Enclo No. 4 to S.E. 6th No. 409 M.D. 16-3-97

No. 409 M.D.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,

Trichinopoly, 16th March 1897.

O/m

From

Lt Col. O. V. Boddy R.E.
~~The~~ **Sperintending Engineer,**
6th Circle.

18

To

The Chief Engineer,
for Irrigation.

SIR,

4. ENCLOSURES.

I have the honor to forward herewith a revised estimate for the excavation of the X. Branch channel of the Periar canal.

2. The difficulty that has been experienced in drawing up this estimate and the method adopted in doing so, is set forth in letter No: 103 E. dated 14 January 1897, from the Executive Engineer on Special Duty, Madura, a copy of which is forwarded.

3. The amount of the revised estimate is Rs 95,890. The original estimate as per Project Blue Book for the work was Rs 66,225, and the same amount was sanctioned in the Revised Estimate approved in G.O. No: 97 I d/ 3 February 1894. The

excess therefore of the revised over the original estimate amounts to Rs 29,665.

4. The chief cause for this excess as explained in the comparative statement is that in consequence of the F. S. L. of the channel being increased from 2' to 3', and the fall per mile reduced from 6" to 3", a realignment of the channel was found necessary, which again necessitated rock cutting and heavy embankments for which enhanced rates had to be paid.

5. The manner in which this estimate has been drawn up leaves much to be desired, but as the Executive Engineer, who is on the spot, is unable to submit a more satisfactory one, I forward the estimate, as it is, for your approval and sanction.

6. The work is approaching completion and has been paid for at the rates entered in the revised estimate; the expenditure on the work up to the end of December 1896

is Rs 85,544.

20

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed[t] Servant.

O.V. Bosley
Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer, VI Circle

D.C.B.
18/8/97

Enclosures: 4.
1. Comparative Statement.
1. Abstract Estimate
1. Statt. of work done up to 31st May-97, remaining to be done &ca
1. Copy of Spl. Ine Engrs letter No: 103 d/14-1-97.

P. W. D. 6th CIRCLE.

FROM

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

6TH CIRCLE.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION

No. H42 Mid

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER,

NO.

Dated. } 189 .
Received. }

Enclosure.

6455 / 3426 | 9